Greetings from CMR journal!

Attached is the comments of your manuscript.

Please follow these comments to make a major revision in order to review further.

We are looking forward to receiving your revised paper.

------------------------------------------------------

**Reviewer A:**

**Our responses are found in red**

The following literatures were cited in the paper but not found in the reference list.

(Zelenzy, Chua and Aldrich, 2000**): spelling mistake and it is corrected. Please refer to the reference section page 18.**

(Kauser, 1995): **please refer to page 14**

(Kauser, 1995); **please refer to page 14**

Jamal, Sidani and Safieddine, 2005: **spelling mistake and it is corrected. Please refer to the reference section page 14**

Authors (2012): **Please refer to the reference section page 13**

Widegren, 1998: **Please refer to the reference section page 18**

(Beutel & Marini, 1995): **Please refer to the reference section page 14**

2.The following references were cited in the paper, but not found in the content of paper.

Jamali, D., Y. Sidani, and A. Safieddine. 2005. Constraints facing working women in Lebanon: An insider view. Women in Management Review, 20 (8), 581-594. **Please refer to page 4.**

Kausar, Z. 1995. Women in feminism and politics: New directions towards Islamization. Selangor, Malaysia : International Islamic University Malaysia. **Please refer to page 4. Spelling mistake (Kauser instead of Kausar).**

Widegren, O. (1988). The new environmental paradigm and personal norms. Environment and Behavior, 30, 75–100.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013916598301004>. **Please refer to page 5**

Zelezny, L., Chua, P. and Alrich, C. (2000). Elaborating on gender differences in environmentalism. Journal of Social Issues, 56 (3), pp.443-57. **Please refer to page 3. Spelling mistake.**

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer B:

No contribution of this research can be found. The authors suggest that Lebanon is categorized as a male-dominant culture and the study is based on the socialization theory where individual behavior is shaped by gender expectation in relation to the cultural context. The explanations of how is a male-dominant culture different with other cultures and then how the attitude of women and male could be influenced, is expected. However, the literature review and reasoning is not enough or even is lack to convince readers. Especially, the research hypotheses are based on the findings of the researches in Western culture context rather than the socializing in the Lebanon culture context. The findings are the same with that of western researches. I wonder the importance of conducting this research.

------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer D:

Plagiarism check results: no serious plagiarism issue.

The paper titled "FEMALE vs. MALE DIFFERENCES IN CONSUMER GREEN PURCHASING BEHAVIOR AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN AND ATTITUDE: AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION FROM A LEBANESE PERSPECTIVE" is well written and is grammatically correct.

The author has done amount of literatures search. However, the paper could benefit more from the following suggestions:

1. The literature review is not enough. Author should put more effort on

literature review. Authors have to do more reflective writing and giving more arguments as well as providing more in-depth literature of the purchasing behavior.

2. The hypotheses need more rigorous inference. Some part of the text should

add more literatures and discussion from authors. Why these hypotheses and questions come out? The questions are poorly match with the inference and without rigorous discussion. Author should find out the purpose of the study and put more effort on literature review. Especially, the research hypotheses are based on the findings of the researches in Western culture context rather than the socializing in the Lebanon culture context. The findings are the same with that of western researches.

3. There is no statement about validity. The author should also provide

average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) value on all variables.

4. Please draw the structure of the whole research model (Conceptual

Framework). The research can not let the reader know the whole framework.

5. The study does not give a comprehensive view of the objectives that were

studied. No contribution of this research can be found. Appropriate statistical tools must be enhanced to get meaningful results.

Overall, the author has initiated a review that will be useful for researchers and practitioners alike. I encourage the author to consider continuing this review and improving on it.

**Reviewer B & D**

**Our response:**

1. **We took into consideration the reviewers comments and we further analyzed the literature and we changed the research question to examine the moderator effect of gender and not the gender difference.**
2. **Our study was based on the socialization theory.**
3. **We increased the sample and we changed the statistical method and we tested the moderator effect of gender on the relationship between environmental attitude and concern towards green purchasing behavior.**
4. **We also add the conceptual model graph as recommended please refer to page 7.**
5. **We included as well the reliability and the extracted variance in table 1, please refer to page 8.**
6. **Finally contribution: the difference in environmental development across cultures makes cross culture studies so important for better green marketing and green legislation, which in return would benefit better the implementation of green strategies and rules in real world (Chan and Lau, 2002).**